


REMARKS

On June 16, 2003, the Examiner issued a Non-Final Office Action rejecting claims 1-4, 10-15 and 27-33, and objecting to claims 5-9, 16-26 and 34. In response, Applicants have made an appropriate amend to the specification and respectfully request favorable reconsideration for the following reasons:

1. Regarding Item 3 (of the pending Office Action, the current pending claims include amendments made in a reply to a PCT Written Opinion, and therefore the "amended claims" and the "pending claims" are alternative expressions for the same subject matter. To minimize confusion, Applicants will henceforth refer to claims pending before the Examiner as "pending claims."
2. Regarding Items 8 and 9, Applicants have amended the specification as requested by the Examiner. Although Applicants feel the added subject matter is fully supported by the disclosure, the added (and now deleted) subject matter is unnecessary for properly disclosing Applicants' invention, and therefore there is no need for Applicants to now argue for inclusion.
3. Regarding Item 11, Applicants respectfully submit that:
 - 3.1 the Watanabe reference does not suggest or teach a comb polymer having distinct backbone and side arm segments, as are critical to the present invention;
 - 3.2 the Watanabe reference is directed to a very different polymer structure, involving crosslinking, and because the polymers of Watanabe are crosslinked, they cannot be characterized as having distinct backbones and side-arms, as is a critical feature of the present invention.
 - 3.3 Applicants' comb polymers provide improved photoresist properties as illustrated in Figure 1 of the pending Application, and this discovery is not suggested or taught in the Watanabe reference; and
 - 3.4 The Watanabe reference teaches a very different approach to photoresist chemistry -- in the Watanabe reference, photo-exposure causes breakdown of crosslinks, i.e., changing the connectivity of the polymer matrix; whereas the present invention is directed to a chemistry where photo-exposure causes breakdown of function groups, i.e., does not change the connectivity of the polymer matrix. An ordinary artisan would not be motivated to create the photoresist chemistry of Applicants' invention from a reading of a Watanabe reference which advocates a very different approach, i.e., a much different photoimaging mechanism.

For the reasons stated, Applicants respectfully requests favorable reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted,



KONRAD S. KAEDING
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 32,035
Telephone: (302) 992-2093
Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: September 17, 2003